

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/791,545	03/01/2004	Marko Areh	2001P15153WOUS 3280 EXAMINER		
46726 7	590 08/18/2006				
JOHN T. WINBURN 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD			ALEXANDER, REGINALD		
NEW BERN, NC 28562			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1761	
			DATE MAILED: 08/18/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Anntingtion No.	A Carrotta				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Occurrence	10/791,545	AREH ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Reginald L. Alexander	1761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 J	uly 2006.					
_						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-5,7,9,10,15,16,18,20,24,25,27-31 and 33-35</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>27-31 and 33-35</u> is/are allowed.						
	☐ Claim(s) <u>2-5,7,15 and 16</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) 9, 10, 18, 20, 24 and 25 is/are object						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<u> </u>	n nciarity under 35 LLC C S 440(a)) (d) or (6)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Burea	•	G				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Response to Amendment

In view of the presence of new prior art references, the final rejection filed 21 April 2006 has been withdrawn. Applicant's amendment filed 24 July 2006 has been entered and a new rejection appears below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 7, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kearnes in view of Ross.

There is disclosed in Kearnes an electrical device having an electrical motor 66, a motor connection comprising: a motor mount 31 configured as a hollow member with an open front wall, the motor mount mounting the electrical motor therein through the open front wall; the device has a circuit board 45 with counter-retaining devices (holes); and the mount has board retaining devices (extensions) 44 connecting with the counter-retaining devices of the circuit board.

There is disclosed in Ross an electrical device having an electrical motor 1 including an edge (outer motor wall surface); a cylindrical motor mount 8 including: opposed open ends for receiving the motor; a "flexible" wall; and detents (screws) 9

Art Unit: 1761

disposed on the wall and projecting radially inwardly, the detent (screws) engaging the edge to retain the motor within the motor mount.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the motor mount of Kearnes with that disclosed in Ross and construct it of a cylindrical shape, for the purpose of providing an alternative arrangement which could be in closer contact with the motor to provide a more stable mounting of the motor.

In regards to the device being a kitchen appliance, there is nothing in the claims which would define what type of appliance or define the device over that disclosed in the prior art.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 10, 18, 20, 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 27-31 and 33-35 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Elliot and Brane are cited for their disclosure of the state of the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/791,545

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reginald L. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

rla

10 August 2006

Reginald L. Alexander

Page 4

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1761